

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, the drawings are objected to based on the reasons set forth on page 2 of the present Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner objects to Fig. 4 because the text in each element of Fig. 4 is allegedly hard to read. Applicant submits herewith a replacement Fig. 4, and Applicant believes that the Examiner's objection to the drawings is obviated.

Claims 1-7 are objected to based on the reasons set forth on page 3 of the present Office Action. Applicant amends claims 1 and 2, as indicated herein, and Applicant believes that the Examiner's objections to the claims are obviated.

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respects to independent claim 1, the Examiner states that the method of this claim is only limited to storing data into a data structure, and therefore, the method does not produce a useful, concrete, and intangible result. Applicant amends claim 1, as indicated herein, and respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection be withdrawn. Applicant further submits that the claimed method and the operations thereof produce a useful result in that the operations of the claimed method allow data to be stored in a more efficient manner, the method is concrete as there are specific operations set forth for performing the method. Finally, the claimed method and the operations thereof produce a tangible result in that a method for storing register properties is set forth, and use of this method produces an exemplary result of data being stored in an efficient manner. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2-7, the Examiner alleges that the claimed data structure, *per se*, is not statutory subject matter since data is intangible, and therefore does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In response, Applicant submits that the claimed data structure is not *per se* non-statutory

subject matter simply because it contains data. The claimed data structure can be, for example, an array or some type of memory structure for storage. These types of devices are clearly statutory subject matter. Furthermore, claims 2-7 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 simply because the claimed data structure contains data, as there are many apparatuses, which are statutory subject matter, that contain data. For example, a computer, a personal digital apparatus, and a radio communication device each contain data, and these devices are statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 21, 2006

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 10/692,681

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q77985

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement Fig. 4 is attached herewith.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets